

REMARKS

Claims 61-63, 65-70, 72-77, and 79-81 were pending in this application.

Claims 61-63, 65-70, 72-77, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,288,716 ("Humpleman").

Summary of Applicants Reply

Applicants have amended claims 61, 63, 68, 70, 75, and 77 to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments and the amendments are fully supported by the original specification.

Applicants' Reply to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Applicants' amended independent claims 61, 68, and 75 are directed toward methods and systems for generating a virtual representation of one of a plurality of local devices for a remote user access device using a template document at a remote site. Each of the plurality of devices are associated with respective display components and each of a plurality of user access device types are associated with respective template documents at the remote site. The template documents contain a layout including placeholders that specify an arrangement of display components and support the plurality of local devices. A request is received at the remote site to access the local device from a remote user access device. The remote user access type of the remote user access device is determined and a template document associated with the determined user access type is selected at the remote site. At least one display component is retrieved for the requested local device and inserted into a placeholder of the selected template document at the remote site. The virtual representation for the local device is generated using the

selected template document at the remote site. Finally, the generated virtual representation for the local device is transmitted from the remote site to the remote access device.

Humpleman refers to a browser based command and control home network in which "each home device sends its own custom GUI" to a display device. (Humpleman, column 7, lines 14-15). Furthermore, "the look and feel of the GUI originates with the attached server [i.e., home device] and not with the client [i.e., the display device]." (Id., column 8, lines 35-37). A session manager running on the home network is used to display the custom GUIs of the home devices on a display device. The session manager includes "its own HTML page files, including a top-level, home HTML file," which link to the custom GUIs of the home devices. (Id., column 19, lines 8-9). The home network may be accessed over the Internet via a local Internet proxy. (Id., column 21, lines 1-10).

The Examiner contends that Humpleman shows associating user access device types with respective template documents and selecting a template document that is associated with a determined user access device type. In support for this contention, the Examiner states "each device contains a LOGO image file associated with manufacturer's name, device name, device type, device model..." and "selecting the button/icon associated with device type/capability based on the determining the device capability." (Office Action, p. 2-3).

These quotes as well as the portions of Humpleman cited by the Examiner merely refer to the custom GUIs sent by the home devices. The GUIs of Humpleman are customized for their respective home device based on the capabilities of the home device. However, the GUIs of Humpleman are not associated with, or selected based on an access device type.

Rather, as described above, the "look and feel" of the GUI is based on the home device and not the display device. In fact, Humpleman only refers to a single display device, namely a personal computer. Therefore, because Humpleman shows only one access device type, Humpleman cannot show "associating each of a plurality of user access device types with respective template documents," as recited by applicants' amended independent claims.

Furthermore, because in Humpleman the GUIs are provided by the home device in order to provide the same "look and feel" of the home device regardless of the display device and are not generated from template documents selected based on a user access device type, Humpleman also does not show "selecting a template document associated with the determined user access device type," as recited by applicants' amended independent claims.

Moreover, Humpleman also does not show a remote site that, amongst other features, receives a request from a remote access device to access a local device, generates a virtual representation of the local device from a display component and a template, and transmits the virtual representation to the remote access device. Instead, if Humpleman's home networks is accessed by a remote access device, the remote access device must connect directly to the home network via an Internet proxy and receives GUIs directed from the home devices. Thus Humpleman also does not show the remote site recited by applicants' amended independent claims.

Accordingly, Humpleman does not show all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended independent claims 61, 68, and 75 be withdrawn. Claims 62, 63, 65-67, 69, 70, 72-74, 76, 77, and 79-81 depend from of amended independent claims 61, 68, and

75, respectively. For at least this reason, applicants also respectfully request that the rejection of 62, 63, 65-67, 69, 70, 72-74, 76, 77, and 79-81 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application, including claims 61-63, 65-67, 68-70, 72-74, 75-77, and 79-81, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/
Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Attorney for Applicants

ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473